



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/964,373	09/28/2001	Keegan F. O'Neill	VIP-101	2261
21272	7590	03/21/2008		
LAW OFFICES OF MORLAND C FISCHER			EXAMINER	
2030 MAIN ST			PYZOCHA, MICHAEL J	
SUITE 1300				
IRVINE, CA 92614			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2137	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/21/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/964,373

Applicant(s)

O'NEILL ET AL.

Examiner

MICHAEL PYZOCHA

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 April 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-6 are pending.
2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 04/10/2007 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Connell (US 5991882) in view of Bahlmann (US 6546392).

As per claim 1, O'Connell discloses a method for enabling an original password to be reset on a host computer from a remote workstation by an authorized user without logging onto the host computer, said method comprising the steps of: storing on said host computer a user registration profile including personal information selected by the authorized user (see column 3 lines 7-32); connecting said remote workstation to said host computer (see Figure 2); interrogating the authorized user for the personal information stored on said host computer as said user registration profile (see column 4 lines 50-67); comparing the personal information provided by the authorized user with the personal information stored on said host computer (see column 5 lines 1-27); and resetting the password provided that the personal information provided by the information that is stored on said host computer; and authorized user matches the personal (see column 6 lines 9-19).

IU fails to disclose capturing the identity of said remote workstation by said host computer and the user sending the new password.

However, Bahlmann teaches capturing the identity of said remote workstation by said host computer and the user sending the new password (see column 6 lines 42-64).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art for O'Connell's password changing system to capture a workstation identity and for the password to be sent by the user.

Motivation to do so would have been to restrict password resets to a specific computer (see Bahlmann column 6 lines 42-64).

As per claim 2, the modified O'Connell and Bahlmann system discloses picking questions and the corresponding answers to be stored on the host computer as the personal information that forms said user registration profile (see O'Connell column 6 lines 9-19).

5. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified O'Connell and Bahlmann system as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Schneier (Applied Cryptography).

As per claim 3, the modified O'Connell and Bahlmann system fails to disclose encrypting the registration profile and storing the encrypted user registration profile at a secure location of the host computer.

However, Schneier teaches these security features (see pages 220-223).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Schneier's encryption and storage in the modified O'Connell and Bahlmann system.

Motivation to do so would have been to secure the information.

6. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified O'Connell and Bahlmann system as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Gong (US 6192476).

As per claim 4, the modified O'Connell and Bahlmann system fails to disclose the use of a computer program to change the password.

However, Gong teaches this limitation (see column 13 lines 12-21).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Gong's computer program for resetting the password in the modified O'Connell and Bahlmann system.

Motivation to do so would have been to only allow code from specific sources to reset the password.

7. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified O'Connell, Bahlmann, and Gong

system as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Schneier.

As per claim 5, the modified O'Connell, Bahlmann and Gong system fails to disclose deleting the program after its use.

However, Schneier teaches deleting private information (see pages 184-185).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Schneier's method of deleting private information to delete the password program of the modified O'Connell, Bahlmann, and Gong system.

Motivation to do so would have been that in a computer system, information can be easily copied.

8. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified O'Connell and Bahlmann system as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Jacobs et al. (US 5611048).

As per claim 6, the modified O'Connell and Bahlmann system fails to disclose the use of a predetermined account name allowed to reset passwords.

However, Jacobs et al. teaches the use of only allowing specific user(s) to change the password (see column 2 lines 8-33).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to only Jacobs et al's specific user(s) to change the password in the modified O'Connell and Bahlmann system.

Motivation to do so would have been update remote system's passwords, which the user has access.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Pyzocha whose telephone number is (571) 272-3875. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm first Fridays of the bi-week off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MJP

Application/Control Number: 09/964,373

Page 9

Art Unit: 2137

/Emmanuel L. Moise/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2137